

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached new sheet of drawings includes a new Figure 4. In Figure 4, multiple radiation-emitting and/or radiation receiving semiconductor components are shown, where an injection channel is led through each of the multiple semiconductor components.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

New Sheet (1 pages)

REMARKS

In reply to the Office Action of May 14, 2009, Applicants have canceled claims 1-8, 10-20, 24-28, and 38-40. No claims have been amended or added. Accordingly, claims 9 and 31-37 are pending, with claim 9 in independent form.

The Action objected to the drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83(a), requiring that the drawings show “the multiple radiation-emitting and/or radiation receiving semiconductor components and the injection channel led through each of the multiple semiconductor components” recited in claim 9 (Action at page 2). In this reply, Applicants have included a new Figure 4. Figure 4 shows multiple components 1, each of which contacts a corresponding leadframe 10 and is positioned in a cavity 50. An injection channel 55 runs through each of the cavities 50 housing the components 1. The subject matter of new Figure 4 is supported, for example, by the original disclosure in the English translation of the specification at page 7, lines 15-20. In this reply, Applicants have amended this portion of the specification to include a specific reference to new Figure 4 and the labeled features thereof. Moreover, Applicants have inserted a new paragraph in the list of drawings that provides a brief description of Figure 4. In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that the drawings fully comply with the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.83(a), and therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

The Action objected to the specification, noting that reference numeral 12 was used to denote two different features (Action at page 3). Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out this error. In the paragraph beginning on page 7, line 6, “plastic film 12” is a typographical error that should instead read “plastic film 102” to ensure consistency with, for example, page 7, line 12 (e.g., “plastic film 102”) and Figure 3. In this reply, Applicants have amended the above paragraph to include the proper reference numeral. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

Claim 20 stands objected to under 37 CFR § 1.75(c) as allegedly failing to further limit the subject matter of the claim from which it depends. Applicants have canceled claim 20,

obviating this objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claim 20.

Claims 1, 7, 8, 39, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sakamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,489,637, "Sakamoto") in view of Steffen (U.S. Patent No. 5,147,982, "Steffen"). Claims 2-4, 10-12, 27, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Steffen, and further in view of Bank et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,971,747, "Bank"). Claims 5, 6, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Steffen, and further in view of McNulty et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0180351, "McNulty"). Claims 13-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Steffen, Bank, and McNulty.

Applicants do not concede any of the above rejections. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have canceled claims 1-8, 10-20, 27, 28, 39, and 40 in this reply, making the above rejections moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-8, 10-20, 27, 28, 39, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The only pending claims in the present application following the amendments herein are claims 9 and 31-37. The Action indicated that these claims were allowed (Action at page 14), for which indication Applicants thank the Examiner. In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, which action is requested.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Any circumstance in which Applicants have: (a) addressed certain comments of the Examiner does not mean that Applicants concede other comments of the Examiner; (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims; or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that Applicants concede any of the Examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Fees for the Petition for Extension of Time are being paid concurrently on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 12406-0187US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 14, 2009

/Marc M. Wefers Reg. No. 56,842/

Marc M. Wefers
Reg. No. 56,842

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945